

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 DERRICK NATHANIEL,
12 Plaintiff,
13 v.
14 NEW UNITED MOTOR MA
15 INC., et al.,
Defendants

No. C 04-5082 MMC

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
WITHDRAW; TERMINATING
APPLICATION OF ELECTRONIC CASE
FILING PROGRAM TO ACTION**

14 NEW UNITED MOTOR MANUFACTURING,
15 INC., et al.,
Defendants

15 Defendants

18 Before the Court is The Armstrong Law Firm's motion to withdraw as counsel of
19 record for plaintiff Derrick Nathaniel ("Nathaniel"). Nathaniel has not filed opposition or
20 other response to the motion.¹ Having considered the papers submitted, the Court deems
21 the matter appropriate for decision on the papers, VACATES the hearing scheduled for
22 September 23, 2005, and rules as follows:

23 1. The motion to withdraw is hereby GRANTED.

2. Because Nathaniel is no longer represented by counsel, the Court hereby

25 TERMINATES application of the Electronic Case Filing program to the action. All further

1 documents filed in the action shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court on paper and served
2 by mail or in person on the opposing party.

3 3. This order and all documents filed in the future shall be served upon Nathaniel at
4 the following address:²

5 Derrick Nathaniel
6 3941 Norton Avenue
7 Oakland CA 94602

8 4. A status conference remains scheduled for November 18, 2005, at 10:30 a.m.,
9 Courtroom 7, 19th Floor, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California. All parties,
10 including Nathaniel, are required to attend. Further, a joint status conference statement
remains due on Thursday, November 10, 2005.³

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: September 12, 2005


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

25
26 ²Should Nathaniel's address change, Nathaniel must promptly file with the Clerk of
the Court and serve on defendant a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new
27 address. See Civil L.R. 3-11(a).

28 ³The Pretrial Preparation Order, filed April 4, 2005, erroneously refers to November
10 as "Friday," when, in fact, it is a Thursday.